



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,214	01/23/2004	Edward A. Zumbiel	RWZ/77	9137
26875	7590	07/28/2005		
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			EXAMINER DURAND, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/764,214

Applicant(s)

ZUMBIEL ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Durand

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/23/2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                             | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>07182005</u> . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                                                      |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the request for reconsideration filed on 7/8/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2,5-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams Jr. (US 5,329,747) in view of Chapman et al (US 3,111,221).

In regard to claims 1 and 2, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including producing and erecting and filling a carton 10, with convenience feature in the form of handle 16, over wrapping the filled carton with shrink wrap (no number given), and singly scoring a portion of the film proximate the convenience feature in the form of a cutout, which allows access to the convenience feature (see entire document). What Williams does not disclose is the use of a scored convenience feature comprised of multiple cuts. However, Chapman teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packaging to provide a scored openings 54 in a film 42, which may be scored before or after the film is applied to the grouped items 11-16, held together by spacer 34 for the purpose of allowing access to the convenience features 52 (see Fig.1 and C2,L3-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Williams with the scoring means as taught by Chapman for the purpose of allowing access to the convenience features.

In regard to claim 5, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including covering the entire carton 10 with the film (see Fig.1).

In regard to claim 7, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including accessing the convenience feature without removing any items from the carton.

In regard to claim 6, Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the remoteness of the packaging location. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to provide a different location for filling a carton, and another location for wrapping a carton for the purpose of increasing manufacturing throughput.

In regard to claims 9 and 10, Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a wrapping film 26 fed from a single roll 35. What the modified invention of Williams does not disclose is the wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have provided a wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material, since applicant has not disclosed that providing a wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the invention would do.

In regard to claims 11 and 12, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including scoring the film after it is on the carton (see C3,L7-20).

4. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams Jr. in view of Kilby (US 4,396,143).

Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to claim 1, except for the use of a carton with scored convenience features, which also substantially encloses the contents. However, Kilby teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packages to provide a case 10, with convenience features in the form of handles 24 and dispenser 50, filling the case with beverages 52, such that each beverage is bounded by the carton for the purpose of forming a case and allowing access to it (see Figs. 1,2 and C2,L48 – C3,L420).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Williams with the carton as taught by Kilby for the purpose of forming an easy open and accessible package.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams Jr. in view of Littmann (US 5,229,180).

Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to claim 1, except for the use of laser to score the package. However, Littmann teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packaging to provide a completely covered package with a scored film 10 with laser scoring 18 and metal strip 19 functioning as a die and

proximate and aligned with a convenience feature in the form of reclosable tape 20 for the purpose of making a package easier to open (see Figs. 1,2 and C5,L40-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Williams with the scoring means as taught by Littmann for the purpose of forming an easy open and accessible package.

6. Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams Jr. in view of Killy and in further view of Littmann.

In regard to claims 13 and 16, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including producing and erecting and filling a carton 10, with convenience feature in the form of handle 16, over wrapping the filled carton with shrink wrap, while covering the entire carton 10 with the film (no number given), and singly scoring a portion of the film proximate the convenience feature, which allows access to the convenience feature (see entire document). What Williams does not disclose is the use of a formed carton, which is filled and has the shrink-wrapped scored. However, Killy teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packages to provide a case 10, with convenience features in the form of handles 24 and dispenser 50, filling the case with beverages 52, such that each beverage is bounded by the carton for the purpose of forming a case and allowing access to it (see Figs. 1,2 and C2,L48 – C3,L420. Furthermore, Littmann teaches that it is old and well known in the art of packaging to provide a completely covered package with a scored film 10 with laser scoring 18 and metal strip 19 functioning as a die and

proximate and aligned with a convenience feature in the form of reclosable tape 20 for the purpose of making a package easier to open (see Figs. 1,2 and C5,L40-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the invention of Bernard with the carton as taught by Killy and the scoring means as taught by Littmann for the purpose of forming an easy open and accessible package.

In regard to claim 14, the modified invention of Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the remoteness of the packaging location. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known in the art to provide a different location for filling a carton, and another location for wrapping a carton for the purpose of increasing manufacturing throughput.

In regard to claim 15, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including accessing the convenience feature without removing any items <sup>from</sup> ~~the~~ the carton.

In regard to claims 17 and 18, the modified invention of Williams discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a wrapping film 26 fed from a single roll 35. What the modified invention of Bernard does not disclose is the wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have provided a wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material, since applicant has not disclosed that providing a wrapping material having different colors of indicia and utilizing multiple rolls of material solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears the invention would do.

In regard to claims 19 and 20, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including scoring the film after it is on the carton (see C3,L7-20).


***Conclusion***

7. This Office Action is non-final.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Durand whose telephone number is 571-272-4459. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Durand  
July 25, 2005

  
**Stephen F. Gerrity**  
Primary Examiner